



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Ballard

Serial No. 09/454,492

Filed: December 6, 1999

Group Art Unit: 2164

Examiner: Weisberger

For: Remote Image Capture with Centralized Processing and Storage

JAN 0 9 2004 **GROUP 3600**

RECEIVED

RESPONSE TO REQUIREMENT FOR INFORMATION

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed June 18, 2003, Applicant respectfully presents his response to the Requirement for Information in that Office Action.

The Examiner required information regarding patent infringement suits against parties named RDM, EDS, and Viewpointe Archive Services. Specifically, the Examiner required identification of the alleged infringing devices, and all depositions, interrogatories, and pleadings that discuss the alleged infringing devices.

Applicant encloses the following documents in response to this request:

1. Complaint in DataTreasury Corp. v. Electronic Data Systems Corp., Cause No. 3-02CV2643-M, In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division, in which the EDS NetDeposit® Digital Check Processing system is identified as an accused infringing device.

- 2. Complaint in *DataTreasury Corp. v. RDM Corp. a.k.a. Research Development and Manufacturing Corp.*, Cause No. 3-02CV2641-M, In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division, in which the electronic check conversion and payment archive systems of RDM Corp. are identified as accused infringing devices.
- Complaint in *DataTreasury Corp. v. Viewpointe Archive Services, L.L.C.*, Cause No. 3-02CV2642-N, In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division, in which the check image archive technology of Viewpointe Archive Services, L.L.C. are identified as accused infringing devices.

On information and belief, the accused infringing devices and products of EDS include the EDS NetDeposit® Digital Check Processing system noted in the Complaint, the accused infringing devices and products of RDM Corp. included their Payment Archive service and their check imagers and scanners, and the accused infringing products of Viewpointe Archive Services include the imaging archive systems and services provided by Viewpointe Archive Services.

On information and belief, the litigation against RDM Corp. has settled, with RDM agreeing to a license under the asserted patents on June 3, 2003.

Further in the spirit of full compliance with the Request for Information, Applicant wishes to advise the Patent and Trademark Office of additional litigation involving U.S. Patent No. 6,032,137 and U.S. Patent No. 5,910,988, through which this application claims priority. To this end, Applicant enclosed copies of the following complaints:

1. Complaint in *DataTreasury Corp. v. Bank One Corp.*, Cause No. 3-03CV0059-K, In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Dallas

Division, in which the check processing and check imaging systems of Bank One are identified as accused infringing devices.

- Complaint in DataTreasury Corp. v. First Data Corporation, et al., Cause No. 502CV094, In the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Texarkana Division.
- 3. Complaint in *DataTreasury Corp. v. Ingenico S.A., et al.*, Cause No. 502CV095, In the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Texarkana Division.
- 4. Complaint in *DataTreasury Corp. v. J.P. Morgan Chase & Co., et al.,* Cause No. 502CV124, In the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Texarkana Division.

In addition, according to the local rules of the Texarkana Division of the Eastern District of Texas, plaintiff DataTreasury Corp. has submitted Preliminary Infringement Contentions to the Court in each of the First Data, J.P. Morgan Chase, and Ingenico lawsuits. These Preliminary Infringement Contentions specify particular claims of the patents in suit, and the specific "accused instrumentalities" that are alleged to infringe those claims. In this regard, Applicant encloses copies of the following documents:

- 1. Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Preliminary Infringement Contentions in *DataTreasury Corp. v. First Data Corporation, et al.*, Cause No. 502CV094, In the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Texarkana Division.
- 2. Plantiff's First Amended Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Preliminary Infringement Contentions in *DataTreasury Corp. v. First Data Corporation, et al.*, Cause No. 502CV094, In the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Texarkana Division.

- 3. Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Preliminary Infringement Contentions in *DataTreasury Corp. v. Ingenico S.A., et al.*, Cause No. 502CV095, In the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Texarkana Division.
- 4. Plaintiff's Initial Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Preliminary Infringement Contentions in *DataTreasury Corp. v. J.P. Morgan Chase & Co., et al.,* Cause No. 502CV124, In the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Texarkana Division.

The undersigned understands that the restriction "Confidential – for Outside Counsel Only" designation on these documents is no longer operative.

On information and belief, one of the parties in the *J.P. Morgan Chase & Co.* litigation, namely Affiliated Computer Services, Inc., has agreed to a permanent injunction from practicing the asserted patents.

Further in the spirit of the duty of disclosure, Applicant will soon be filing, under separate cover, a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement citing many prior art references that various ones of the parties defendants in these lawsuits have submitted in support of invalidity defenses. This Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement will also provide documents filed by these defendants specifying those assertions that the patents in suit are invalid.¹

Applicant submits that this response is a good faith effort toward fulfilling the Requirement for Information. The Patent and Trademark Office is urged to call the undersigned if there are any questions about this submission.

¹ MPEP §2001.06(c).

Continued consideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Rodney M. Anderson

Registry No. 31,939

Attorney for Applicant

Anderson, Levine & Lintel, L.L.P. 14785 Preston Road, Suite 650 Dallas, Texas 75254 (972) 664-9554

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING 37 C.F.R. 1.8

The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an enveloped addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on December 17, 2003

Rodney M. Anderson Registry No. 31,939

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0032 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE work Reduction Act 2 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL for FY 2004

Effective 10/01/2003. Patent fees are subject to annual revision.

X Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27

TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT

(\$)	740
(Ψ)	740

Complete if Known					1
Application Number	09/454,492				
Filing Date	December 6, Ballard	1999		- p	<i>,</i> ,,,,,,
First Named Inventor	Ballard		neul		٧E
Examiner Name	Weisberger		UAU 0	0	2004
Art Unit	3624		OTHY U	3	ZUU4

3624

Data PO1CIPDIV Attorney Docket No. METHOD OF PAYMENT (check all that apply) FEE CALCULATION (continued) X Check Money 3. ADDITIONAL FEES Credit card Other None Large Entity 1 Small Entity X Deposit Account: Fee Fee Fee Fee Description Deposit Code (\$) Code (\$) Fee Paid 01-1615 2051 1051 130 65 Surcharge - late filing fee or oath Number Deposit Surcharge - late provisional filing fee or 1052 50 2052 Account Anderson, Levine&Lintel cover sheet 1053 130 1053 130 Non-English specification The Director is authorized to: (check all that apply) 1812 2,520 1812 2,520 For filing a request for ex parte reexamination Charge fee(s) indicated below X Credit any overpayments 1804 920 1804 920* Requesting publication of SIR prior to \underline{X} Charge any additional fee(s) or any underpayment of fee(s) Charge fee(s) indicated below, except for the filing fee Requesting publication of SIR after 1805 1.840 1805 1.8401 to the above-identified deposit account. Examiner action 1251 110 2251 Extension for reply within first month **FEE CALCULATION** 1252 420 2252 210 Extension for reply within second month 1. BASIC FILING FEE 1253 950 2253 475 Extension for reply within third month arge Entity Small Entity Fee Paid Fee Fee Description 740 1254 1.480 2254 740 Extension for reply within fourth month Code (\$) Code 1255 2,010 2255 1,005 Extension for reply within fifth month 1001 770 2001 385 Utility filing fee 1002 340 2002 170 1401 330 2401 Design filing fee 165 Notice of Appeal 1003 530 2003 1402 330 2402 165 Filing a brief in support of an appeal 265 Plant filing fee 1004 770 2004 385 Reissue filing fee 1403 290 2403 145 Request for oral hearing 1005 160 2005 1451 1.510 1451 1,510 Petition to institute a public use proceeding Provisional filing fee 1452 110 2452 55 Petition to revive - unavoidable SUBTOTAL (1) 1453 1,330 2453 665 Petition to revive - unintentional 2. EXTRA CLAIM FEES FOR UTILITY AND REISSUE 1501 1.330 2501 665 Utility issue fee (or reissue) Fee from Extra Claims 1502 480 2502 below 240 Design issue fee Total Claims -201 1503 640 2503 320 Plant issue fee Independent 1460 130 1460 130 Petitions to the Commissioner Multiple Dependent 1807 50 1807 50 Processing fee under 37 CFR 1.17(q) Large Entity Small Entity 180 1806 1806 180 Submission of Information Disclosure Stmt Fee Fee Fee Description 40 Recording each patent assignment per Code (\$) Code (\$) 8021 40 8021 property (times number of properties) 1202 18 2202 9 Claims in excess of 20 385 Filing a submission after final rejection (37 CFR 1.129(a)) 1809 770 2809 Independent claims in excess of 3 1201 86 2201 43 1203 290 2203 145 Multiple dependent claim, if not paid 1810 770 2810 385 For each additional invention to be examined (37 CFR 1.129(b)) 1204 86 2204 ** Reissue independent claims over original patent 1801 770 2801 385 Request for Continued Examination (RCE) 1205 18 2205 Reissue claims in excess of 20 1802 900 1802 900 Request for expedited examination 9 and over original patent of a design application Other fee (specify) SUBTOTAL (2) *Reduced by Basic Filing Fee Paid SUBTOTAL (3) **or number previously paid, if greater; For Reissues, see above (\$) 740

SUBMITTED BY (Complete (if applicable)) Registration No. Name (Print/Type) Telephone 972-664-9554 31,939 Rodnev_M Signature Date Dec. 2003

WARNING: Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.17 and 1.27. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.